Exhibit 300 (BY2009)

PART ONE	
OVERVIEW	
1. Date of Submission:	2007-06-01
2. Agency:	015
3. Bureau:	10
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	Payment Application Modernization (PAM)
5. Unique Project Identifier:	015-10-01-14-01-1450-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009?
Mixed Life Cycle

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?
FY2001 or earlier

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap.
This investment includes the RO Legacy payment applications as well as the PAM project. The production & delivery of Federal payments is one of the Government's most important functions. PAM is an effort to replace 30+ existing FMS payment applications which generate check and EFT payments on behalf of Federal Program Agencies (FPAs) with a single application. Primary gaps addressed by the PAM effort include: multiple payment systems written in outdated languages, inability to meet legislative and FPA changes/requests quickly, and labor intensive manual processes. Justification: PAM was initiated as a result of the Y2K efforts. It was determined like functionality existed across 30+ applications which would be improved by the development and implementation of a single application to be developed and maintained by FMS. The legacy applications are written in COBOL and Assembler languages, for which, new resources to support the legacy applications can no longer be obtained. Current developers that support the legacy applications are expected to retire approximately within 5-10 years. PAM System Goals: - Utilize COTS products, particularly for applications components such as workflow and reporting - Use extensible markup language (XML) - Provide access to internal users via a portal - Encourage processing reengineering interfacing applications - Support single sign-on capabilities - Standardization of project management processes PAM Benefits: *One file format *Consolidation to a modular payment application with common functionality and configuration control *Data consolidated in a single relational database *Larger pool of qualified resources to operate and maintain the new application, written in more modern technologies *Ability to efficiently implement legislative mandated programming changes in one application *Ability to respond efficiently to payment change requests made by FPAs *Operational efficiencies resulting from the reduction of required manual and exception processing interventions *Implementation of standard processes and procedures across Financial Centers *Reduce IR and RO costs associated with continued maintenance of the 30+ payment applications (file formats) *Payment application will be aligned with the FMS "to be" Enterprise Architecture (EA) *Implementation of improved (e.g. one system to recover opposed to 30 + payment applications/file formats) BCP, DR and COOP

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?
yes

9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?
2007-08-16

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?
yes

11. Project Manager Name:

Project Manager Phone:

Project Manager Email:

11.a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?	
TBD	
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	
yes	
12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	
yes	
12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	
no	
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	
yes	

If yes, select the initiatives that apply:

Eliminating Improper Payments

Expanded E-Government

Financial Performance

13.a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)	
FP-PAM standardizes payment processes & reduces costs using modules with flexibility to accommodate agencies' requests and legislative mandates. E-gov- Utilizes web-based technologies to improve timeliness and reporting. PAM has new standard format (previously 30+ formats) with supporting e-mail functionality. PAM incorporates GWA reporting req'mts and supports EFT/EDI req'mts. EIP-PAM automates manual processes, enhances system validations and issues alerts to prevent erroneous payments.	
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?	
yes	
14.a. If yes, does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?	
no	
14.b. If yes, what is the name of the PARTed program?	
Financial Management Service Payments	
14.c. If yes, what rating did the PART receive?	
Effective	
15. Is this investment for information technology?	
yes	
16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?	
Level 3	
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)	
(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment	
18. Is this investment identified as high risk on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB memorandum M-05-23)?	
yes	
19. Is this a financial management system?	
yes	
19.a. If yes, does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	
yes	
19.a.1. If yes, which compliance area:	
Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level, Financial Systems Requirements and Accounting Standards, Integrated Financial Management Systems, Reconciliation Procedures, and Accurate and Timely Reporting of Financial Information	

19.b. If yes, please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A11 section 52.	
Regional Financial Center (RFC) Payment Systems--RFC PAY Payment Application Modernization--PAM	

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	0
Software	0
Services	94
Other	6

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?
n/a
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions.
Name
Phone Number
Title
Email
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?
yes
24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?
no

SUMMARY OF SPEND

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated Government FTE Cost, and should be excluded from the amounts shown for Planning, Full Acquisition, and Operation/Maintenance. The total estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for Planning, Full Acquisition, and Operation/Maintenance. For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

All amounts represent Budget Authority

	PY-1 & Earlier	PY	CY
	-2006	2007	2008
Planning Budgetary Resources			
Acquisition Budgetary Resources			
Maintenance Budgetary Resources			
Government FTE Cost			
# of FTEs			

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies).

Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?
no
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.
Last July 2006, a Baseline Change Request was submitted to OMB to reflect higher, and more accurate, Operations and Maintenance costs for the Legacy application as well as lower, and more accurate, vendor development costs for the modernization effort. Additionally, the methodology used to allocate project costs to milestones was modified to align FY costs with specific FY milestones.

PERFORMANCE

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding Measurement Area and Measurement Grouping identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.

	Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
1	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Payments	Percentage of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	99.99% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	100% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	As of 5.31.07, 100% of check and EFT payments were processed accurately and 100% of the payments were processed on time
2	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Knowledge Management	Number of FMS developers integrated into PAM development team, allowing FMS to achieve self-sufficiency	3 FMS developers currently integrated onto Software Development Group	Up to 8 FMS developers integrated into the Software Development Group	As of 6.30.07, 5 developers are currently integrated into the Software Development Group; classroom training for additional three developers has been initiated
3	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percentage of Federal Program Agencies satisfied with payment processing with their respective servicing Regional Financial Center	58% of Federal Program Agencies were very satisfied with payment processing by their servicing Regional Financial Centers	75% of Federal Program Agencies very satisfied with payment processing	Of the Federal Program Agencies responding, 79% were very satisfied with the processing of check and EFT payments
4	2007	Manage the	Technology	User	Number of	0	44	As of 6/29/07, 23

		U.S. Government's Finances Effectively		Requirements	business documents approved and baselined	requirements documents approved and baselined	requirements documents approved and baselined	requirements documents have been documented and approved; of the 23 documented requirements, 14 have been baselined
5	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Payments	Percentage of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	99.99% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	100% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	
6	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Knowledge Management	Number of FMS developers integrated into PAM development team, allowing FMS to achieve self-sufficiency	7 FMS developers currently integrated into the Software Development Group	Up to 11 FMS developers integrated into the Software Development Group	
7	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeframe to implement legislative and customer changes for legacy payment files	30 payment files (payment types) are maintained, which require up to 8 months to implement legislative and customer changes	24 payment files (payment types) are maintained, which require up to 8 months; 6 now require 6 weeks (on average) to implement legislative and customer changes	
8	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Improvement	Number of manual interventions to process payment files	40,690 manual interventions to process 30+ payment files monthly	39,876 manual interventions to process payment files (A reduction of 814, or 2%, manual interventions)	PAM management team is performing a thorough analysis to provide better targets. Analysis will be completed in August/September 2007. Current figures represent averages.
9	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percentage of Federal Program Agencies satisfied with payment processing with their respective servicing Regional Financial Center	75% of Federal Program Agencies were satisfied with payment processing by their servicing Regional Financial Centers	80% of Federal Program Agencies very satisfied with payment processing	

10	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of legacy payment formats to maintain while implementing a new PAM standard format	30 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format	24 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format (Reduction of 6 formats)	
11	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Payments	Percentage of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	99.99% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	100% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	
12	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Knowledge Management	Number of FMS developers integrated into PAM development team, allowing FMS to achieve self-sufficiency	11 FMS developers currently integrated into Software Development Group	Up to 15 FMS developers integrated into Software Development Group	
13	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeframe to implement legislative and customer changes for legacy payment files	24 payment files (Payment types) are maintained, which require up to 8 months to implement legislative and customer changes	19 payment files (payment types) are maintained which require up to 8 months; 11 payment files now require 6 weeks (on average) to implement legislative and customer changes	
14	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Improvement	Number of manual interventions to process payment files	39,876 manual interventions to process 30+ payment files monthly	6,103 manual interventions to process payment files (A cumulative reduction of 34,587 or 85%, manual interventions)	PAM management team is performing a thorough analysis to provide better targets. Analysis will be completed in August/September 2007. Current figures represent averages.
15	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percentage of Federal Program Agencies satisfied with payment processing with their respective servicing Regional Financial	80% of Federal Program Agencies were very satisfied with payment processing by their servicing Regional	85% of Federal Program Agencies very satisfied with payment processing	

						Center	Financial Centers	
16	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of legacy payment formats to maintain while implementing a new PAM standard format	24 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format	19 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format (Cumulative reduction of 11 formats)	
17	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Payments	Percentage of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	99.99% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	100% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	
18	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Achieve cost savings through FTE reductions	116 RFC FTEs supporting payment processing	100 RFC FTEs supporting the payment process	
19	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeframe to implement legislative and customer changes for legacy payment files	19 payment files (payment types) are maintained, which require up to 8 months to implement legislative and customer changes	6 payment files (payment types) are maintained, which require up to 8 months; 24 payment files now require 6 weeks (on average) to implement legislative and customer changes	
20	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Improvement	Number of manual interventions to process payment files	6103 manual interventions to process 30+ payment files monthly	5289 manual interventions to process payment files (A cumulative reduction of 35,400, or 87%, manual interventions)	PAM management team is performing a thorough analysis to provide better targets. Analysis will be completed in August/September 2007. Current figures represent averages.
21	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percentage of Federal Program Agencies satisfied with payment processing with their respective servicing Regional	85% of Federal Program Agencies were very satisfied with payment processing by their servicing	90% of Federal Program Agencies very satisfied with payment processing	

#	Year					Financial Center	Regional Financial Centers	
						Financial Center	Regional Financial Centers	
22	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of legacy payment formats to maintain while implementing a new PAM standard format	19 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format	6 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format (Cumulative reduction of 24 formats)	
23	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Payments	Percentage of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	99.99% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	100% of check and EFT payments processed accurately and on time	
24	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Savings and Cost Avoidance	Achieve cost savings through FTE reductions	100 RFC FTEs supporting payment processing	72 RFC FTEs supporting the payment process	
25	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Response Time	Timeframe to implement legislative and customer changes for legacy payment files	6 payment files (Payment types) are maintained, which require up to 8 months to implement legislative and customer changes	0 payment files (payment types) are maintained that require up to 8 months; 30 payment files now require 6 weeks (on average) to implement legislative and customer changes	
26	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Improvement	Number of manual interventions to process payment files	5289 manual interventions to process 30+ payment files monthly	4069 manual interventions to process payment files (A cumulative reduction of 36621, or 90%, manual interventions)	PAM management team is performing a thorough analysis to provide better targets. Analysis will be completed in August/September 2007. Current figures represent averages.
27	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Customer Satisfaction	Percentage of Federal Program Agencies satisfied with payment processing with their respective servicing	90% of Federal Program Agencies were very satisfied with payment processing by their	95% of Federal Program Agencies very satisfied with payment processing	

					Regional Financial Center	servicing Regional Financial Centers		
28	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Efficiency	Number of legacy payment formats to maintain while implementing a new PAM standard format	6 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format	0 payment formats are maintained while implementing a new PAM standard format (Cumulative reduction of 30 formats)	

EA

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

yes

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

yes

2.a. If yes, provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

Payment Application Modernization (PAM)

3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture?

yes

3.a. If yes, provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

Central Fiscal Operations Segment Architecture Roadmap (FMS)

4. Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

Component: Use existing SRM Components or identify as NEW. A NEW component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

Reused Name and UPI: A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

Internal or External Reuse?: Internal reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. External reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Funding Percentage: Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

	Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Type	Component	Reused Component Name	Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	Funding %
1	Enterprise Application Integration	Replacing disparate systems with a	Development and Integration	Enterprise Application Integration			No Reuse	20

		standard data model and workflow.					
2	Extraction and Transformation	Transform, import and extract data	Data Management	Extraction and Transformation		No Reuse	40
3	Payment / Settlement	Processing and disbursement of Federal Program Agency payment requests.	Financial Management	Payment / Settlement		No Reuse	20

5. To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component: Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications.

Service Specification: In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

	SRM Component	Service Area	Service Category	Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name)
1	Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	
2	Enterprise Application Integration	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
3	Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
4	Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
5	Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
6	Payment / Settlement	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
7	Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
8	Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	
9	Enterprise Application Integration	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	
10	Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
11	Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	

12	Extraction and Transformation	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
13	Enterprise Application Integration	Service Interface and Integration	Interface	Service Description / Interface	

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?
no

PART TWO

RISK

You should perform a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of the investment's life-cycle, develop a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

yes

1.a. If yes, what is the date of the plan?

2007-07-23

1.b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

yes

1.c. If yes, describe any significant changes:

The Definition of Risk Probability, Impact, and Total Risk Score was added to the Risk Management Plan. The Risk Register has been updated to reflect current project risks and mitigants.

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

A small contingency fund, adding additional resources and funding for various life-cycle phases, has enabled PAM to adjust the critical timeframes associated with the Elaboration Phase (which proves out the highest risk elements of the system) to start and end dates of future tasks and milestones, along with the associated life-cycle costs. Costs associated with two additional developers were added to mitigate against unanticipated issues and/or schedule delays. Current PAM life-cycle costs have been adjusted to accommodate the impact of identified risks associated with the Elaboration Phase and the Agile Framework methodology for development. Risk adjustments for life-cycle cost and schedule variances during the Elaboration Phase lessen the impact of uncertainties during the Construction of PAM and the end state operation and maintenance.

COST & SCHEDULE

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard 748?

yes

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than ± 10%?

yes

2.a. If yes, was it the?

Both

2.b. If yes, explain the variance.

In late FY06 schedule delays for PAM DME milestones occurred. These delays are the result of software tool issues related to an Extract, Transform and Load (ETL) COTS product and its failure to meet the requirements/support nonfunctional requirements for integration into the PAM architecture. Specifically, a component of the tool which was to transfer data to the FMS mainframe did not perform as advertised and after working with the vendor's technical resources over a period of approximately 3 months, the vendor's senior management conceded that the recommended product was too immature and should not be used. Based on the vendor's assessment, the PAM project was required to implement a fundamentally different alternative to the tool. This situation has been time consuming and some of the previous work done to integrate the previously selected tool is not reusable. All schedule implications and dependencies are being assessed.

2.c. If yes, what corrective actions are being taken?
1. The ETL product originally recommended for use didn't meet requirements (e.g., maintainability, flexibility, scalability) for integration into the PAM architecture. C A: The PAM MSG redirected the team to an alternative tool, which was a new and foundationally different ETL tool. Redirection required training, new skill set, and redevelopment of previously developed code. The team developed a level of proficiency with the new tool, allowing good design and development progress. Since 01/07, proficiency was achieved through training, access with tool experts, and involvement of a fiscal agent's contractor resource. The recent code review (03/07) by the vendor's architect indicated the Software Development Group (SDG) is fully competent in developing with the tool and the tool was implemented effectively within the PAM application overall. The team completed the initial code base for Elaboration and conducted preliminary end-to-end application integration testing and some initial performance tests. 2. FMS Computing Environments were not made available as scheduled during FY 2006/2007. Two computing environments (Quality Assurance and User Acceptance) required to complete Elaboration and to continue Construction/Prod. Release 1.0 activities are not yet available/fully functional. As a result, several functional teams must share the limited environment, including limited DASD, for completing independent testing as well as developer focused testing. C A: To date, only one environment is fully functional (Development Integration). QA environment was made available as of March 1, 2007, but implementation problems are still being worked with the vendor. The project team discussed and is in the process of documenting the approach to be used to effectively share the QA environment between QA and UA testers during the remaining elaboration phase activities or until the UA environment is fully functional. In addition, limited available Direct Access Storage Device (DASD) will also need to be shared among the development environment and QA/UA testers. A plan for reallocating DASD at appropriate intervals has been developed.
3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?
yes
3.a. If yes, when was it approved by the agency head?
2006-06-21